

### Remarks

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated April 13, 2006, claims 1-15 are presently pending in the application. A new oath and declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) have been filed. Furthermore, Applicants believe that all of the pending claims are allowable and respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amended claims in the application and the following remarks with respect to the relevant references.

Claim 12 was objected to due to informalities. Claim 12 has been amended.

Claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Claim 12 has been amended to better reflect that the spring plate "separates" from the mounting of the chassis underframe.

Claims 1, 2, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Nagai et al.* (JP2000255236A).

Claim 1 is an independent claim for a wheel suspension system for a motor vehicle. The system comprises a lower link for the attachment of a wheel and a spring having a lower end and an upper end. The spring lower end is arranged on the link and the spring upper end is arranged in a spring plate. The system further comprises a chassis underframe having a mounting for supporting part of the spring plate when the wheel suspension system is not fitted on a body of a motor vehicle. The chassis underframe also comprises at least one pair of bearings for fastening to the body. The spring plate bypasses the chassis underframe and directly engages the body of the vehicle.

The Examiner states that *Nagai* discloses a wheel suspension system comprising a lower link (25); a chassis underframe (5) having at least one pair of bearings (Figs 1 & 3); and a spring (7) having a lower end and an upper end, the lower end of which is arranged on the link and the upper end which is arranged in a spring plate (6); wherein the chassis underframe has a mounting; wherein the mounting annularly surrounds the spring plate; wherein the lower link is designed as a transverse link.

Contrary to the examiner's statement, *Nagai* does not anticipate claim 1. In contrast, *Nagai* fails to disclose a mounting for supporting part of the spring plate when the wheel suspension system is not fitted on a body of a motor vehicle. Furthermore, *Nagai* does not involve spring plates directly engaging the body of the vehicle. Since *Nagai* involves a truck frame, the springs interact with the frame instead of the body.

Therefore, all elements are not disclosed in the *Nagai* reference, so the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn. Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable. Dependent claims 2 and 8 recite limitations similar to the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 8 are also allowable.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nagai et al.*, as cited by applicant, in view of *Martinez, Jr. et al.*(US 4,771,996).

As discussed above, *Nagai* fails to disclose the limitations of independent claims 1 from which claims 5 and 6 depend. In particular, *Nagai* fails to neither disclose a mounting for supporting part of the spring plate when the wheel suspension system is not fitted on a body of a motor vehicle, nor does it involve spring plates directly engaging the body of the vehicle as recited in claim 1 and dependent claim 5 and 6. Further, Applicants have been unable to find any teaching of the foregoing limitations in *Martinez*. In contrast *Martinez* is merely directed toward a striker plate. Thus, it is clear that the combination of references fails to teach all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

Therefore, all elements are not disclosed in the *Martinez* reference, so the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claims 5 and 6.

Conclusion

For the above cited reasons, all of the claims presently pending in this application are submitted to be allowable. The Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' undersigned attorney if it would advance the prosecution of this application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issue.

Please charge the extension of time fee, as well as any additional fees, or credit any overpayment in connection with the filing of this paper, to Ford Global Technologies LLC, Deposit Account No. 06-1510. A duplicate of this paper is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

**Joerg Weshendorff**

By   
Fredrick V. Owens  
Reg. No. 47,837  
Attorney for Applicants

Date: 10/11/2006

**Ford Global Technologies, LLC.**  
330 Town Center Drive  
Suite 800 South  
Dearborn, MI 48126  
Phone: 313-248-5278  
Fax: 313-322-7162

w:\fgt\logcip\fowens1\legal\prosecution\response file\reply\_81091289\_hydro.doc